

Guidelines for Governing Violations of Faculty Qualification Review Regulations at National Yunlin University of Science and Technology

Approved by the 94th University Faculty Evaluation Committee on January 13, 2010

Approved by the 1st University Affairs Meeting of the 2013 academic year on November 6, 2013

Approved by the 1st University Affairs Meeting of the 2020 academic year on December 9, 2020

Approved by the 1st University Affairs Meeting of the 2022 academic year on December 14, 2022

Article 1. YunTech has established these guidelines in accordance with the Ministry of Education's "Principles for Governing Cases of Faculty Members Violating the Regulations for Faculty Qualification Review in Colleges and Above" to govern cases of faculty members violating the regulations of faculty qualification review.

Article 2. The term "violating the regulations for faculty qualification review" (hereinafter referred to as "these regulations") in these guidelines refers to any of the following situations involving the reviewee:

- (i) Intentionally providing false information on the faculty qualification review resume, co-author certification, not accurately indicating co-authorship on representative works, and submitting co-author certification.
- (ii) Forging, plagiarizing, stealing, or other fraudulent activities in works, performances, and technical reports.
- (iii) Forging or altering academic credentials, achievement certificates, specialized works accepted for regular publication, and co-author certifications.
- (iv) The reviewee or others seriously interfering with the reviewer or the review process through solicitation, lobbying, bribery, threats, or other means.
- (v) Other violations of academic ethics.

Article 3. The Faculty Evaluation Committee of YunTech (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") is responsible for governing matters related to violations of these regulations. When necessary, impartial scholars and experts from outside the university may be invited to participate, and the department (institute) and college should assist in the investigation or deliberation of cases violating the regulations.

Article 4. The Committee should immediately initiate a preliminary review process for allegations that specifically accuse someone of violating these regulations and have been verified by the accuser. The Committee generally does not accept anonymous allegations, but if there are specific facts, they should be accepted after confirmation through the preliminary review process. The preliminary reviewers are composed of the convener of the Committee, the Dean of Academic Affairs, the Dean of the College to which the reviewee belongs, and the Director of the Personnel Office. The review should be completed within one week of the start of the preliminary review process to determine whether to accept the case. Cases that are not accepted will be closed after

notifying the accuser in writing; cases that are accepted after the preliminary review will be governed by the Committee according to these guidelines.

Article 5. The Committee should handle allegations of violations of these regulations confidentially during the investigation. Before the allegations are confirmed, they should be handled in a confidential manner to avoid exposing the accuser and the reviewee.

Article 6. Members of the Committee, original reviewers, and external scholars and experts should recuse themselves if they have any of the following relationships with the reviewee:

- (i) Teacher-student relationship.
- (ii) Blood relatives within the third degree of kinship.
- (iii) Spouse or in-laws within the third degree of kinship or have had such a relationship.
- (iv) Academic collaboration.
- (v) Relevant interested parties.
- (vi) Other relationships that should be recused according to other laws.

Article 7. If it is discovered during the review or after the faculty qualification has been reviewed that the reviewee has any of the situations in subparagraphs 1 to 3 or 5 of point 2, the Committee should verify and determine it. If the case is confirmed, the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 3 of Article 44 of the Regulations for the Review of Faculty Qualifications in Colleges and Above should be applied.

Article 8: The University's Faculty Evaluation Committee, when dealing with cases involving the situations specified in Subparagraph 2 or 5 of Article 2, should respect the judgment of the relevant professional field. An investigation team of five to seven members should be formed for each case. The Dean of the College to which the reviewee belongs is an ex-officio member, and at least one member is elected from other colleges. If necessary, the team may also invite impartial external scholars and experts from the relevant professional field. The convener is elected among the team members. The investigation team should request the reviewee to submit a written defense within fourteen days from the date of the letter regarding the report content. The investigation team will then investigate the report content and the defense.

If the report case is a promotion case, the report content and defense should be sent to the original reviewer for reexamination. If necessary, one to three external scholars or experts from the relevant professional field may be invited for review as a cross-check. After the review, the reviewer should submit a review report, which will serve as the basis for the investigation team's investigation and the University Faculty Evaluation Committee's deliberation. The identity of the reviewer should be kept confidential.

The investigation team will compile all investigation materials and the review report submitted by the reviewer, deliberate, and prepare an investigation report and recommendations for next steps, which will be submitted to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for review.

After the report case has been reviewed by scholars or experts in the relevant professional field, the University Faculty Evaluation Committee should invite the reviewee to present an oral defense or attend session to offer explanation during the procedure.

During the deliberation of the University Faculty Evaluation Committee, if there are difficulties in judgment, the original reviewer and relevant scholars and experts may be asked to review the items to be clarified for further judgment.

Article 9: The method of handling the additional review by external scholars and experts in the relevant professional field as mentioned in the second paragraph of the previous article shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions for the generation of external review committee members in the National Yunlin University of Science and Technology Regulations for the Appointment and Promotion Review of Full-time Faculty.

Article 10: During the period of processing faculty qualification review cases, if YunTech discovers that the applicant has violated the circumstances stipulated in Paragraph 4 of Article 2, the school should contact the reviewer who has been interfered with and make a phone record. The convener or chairperson of the University Faculty Evaluation Committee should then verify with the reviewer and submit it to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for review. If the review confirms the violation, the qualification review process will be halted immediately. The University Faculty Evaluation Committee will notify the applicant that their application for faculty qualification will not be accepted for the next two years from the date of notification, and the case will be reported to the Ministry of Education for record.

Article 11: The University Faculty Evaluation Committee should handle reported violations of these regulations based on the principles of fairness, objectivity, and efficiency. For confirmed cases, depending on the type of violation, the severity of the circumstances, and the nature of the work, the University Faculty Evaluation Committee may decide to impose the following penalties:

- (i) Dismissal, suspension, or non-renewal of employment.
- (ii) No annual salary increase or merit pay for the current academic year.
- (iii) Restrictions on participation in all levels of the University Faculty Evaluation Committee and thesis review (oral defense).

Article 12: When the University Faculty Evaluation Committee reviews reported violations of these regulations, a resolution can only be made with the consent of more than half (inclusive) of the

attending members. However, decisions involving dismissal, suspension, or non-renewal of employment require the consent of more than two-thirds (inclusive) of the attending members. If there are members who should recuse themselves from the decision-making process, they will not be included in the member count.

Article 13: YunTech should reach a concrete conclusion within four months from the date of receiving the report and submit it to the University Faculty Evaluation Committee for review. In cases where the case is complex, difficult to proceed, or during winter or summer vacations, the processing period may be extended by two months, and the accuser and the reviewee should be notified.

YunTech should notify the accuser and the reviewee in writing of the results, penalties, and reasons within ten days after the University Faculty Evaluation Committee reviews and makes a penalty decision based on these guidelines.

If the reviewee disagrees with the penalty decision, they should file an appeal within thirty days from the day after receiving the written notice, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the organization and review guidelines of YunTech's Faculty Appeal Review Committee.

Article 14: After YunTech has determined that the applicant has violated the circumstances stipulated in Paragraphs 1 to 3 or Paragraph 5 of Article 2 according to these guidelines, the school should report the procedures, results, and disposition decisions to the Ministry of Education for record.

Article 15: For cases that violate these regulations and are determined by the review to be ineligible for faculty qualification review, and the period of ineligibility is more than five years, YunTech should also notify all universities and colleges, and the execution should not be suspended due to the applicant's appeal or administrative litigation.

Article 16: For cases that have completed the handling procedures and reported to the Ministry of Education, if the faculty member's punishment involves dismissal, suspension, or non-renewal of employment, it should be reported to the Ministry of Education for approval in accordance with the Teachers' Act.

Article 17: If an accusation is determined to be unfounded after investigation, the accuser should be notified of the investigation results in writing, and the person under review should also be informed. If the accuser files the same accusation again, it should be reviewed by the University Teacher Faculty Committee. If the content of the repeated accusation does not present any new concrete evidence, the accuser may be directly informed based on the decision of the previous review. If there is new concrete evidence, the Faculty Evaluation Committee should conduct an investigation and handle the matter according to these guidelines. If the accuser disagrees with the

conclusion, unless a legal complaint is filed, no further action will be taken.

If the accuser is a faculty member at YunTech and their groundless accusations disrupt campus harmony, the Faculty Evaluation Committee may decide on a course of action based on the severity of the situation.

Article 18: If a faculty member's academic achievements, other than those mentioned in Article 2, involve serious violations of academic ethics, plagiarism, theft, or other fraudulent activities, they may be handled in accordance with these guidelines.

Article 19: If project researchers funded by the university's endowment fund are involved in the situations mentioned in Article 2 and the previous article, they should be handled in accordance with these guidelines.

Article 20: These guidelines shall be implemented after being approved by the Administrative Meeting and the University Affairs Meeting, and approved by the President. The same applies when amendments are made.